FILED IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Feb 26, 2018

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

CRYSTAL TROUT, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff.

3

5

6

7

8

11

12

16

17

18

23

24

13 LAKE BREEZE INCORPORATED, an 14 Idaho corporation, and CYD ROSSI, an 15 individual.

Defendants.

NO. 2:17-cy-00214-SAB

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR **DEFAULT JUDGMENT** 

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment, ECF 19 No. 18. Plaintiff requests the Court grant default judgment against Defendant Lake Breeze Incorporated ("Lake Breeze"), and requests a monetary award for damages, including costs and reasonable attorneys' fees. The motion was heard without oral argument. For the reasons set-forth below, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion.

## **FACTS**

On June 5, 2015, Plaintiff Crystal Trout entered into a lease agreement for 25 an apartment at the Crestwood Park apartment complex located in Airway Heights, 26 Washington. Lake Breeze managed the apartment complex, while its employee, 27 Defendant Cyd Rossi, acted as the on-site manager. 28|

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT ^ 1

About a year later, Plaintiff received a written notice alleging she owed Defendants \$760.00 in outstanding rent, late fees, and "dailies." The notice warned 3 Plaintiff that failure to pay could result in eviction status, additional fines, and a 4 negative report to credit reporting agencies. The notice appeared to be sent by an 5 organization titled the "Landlord Protection Agency, Inc."

Plaintiff soon became aware that the notice was in fact sent by Defendant Cyd Rossi in an attempt to collect a debt for Lake Breeze under the guise of a 8 third-party collection agency. This caused Plaintiff to file the instant action challenging Defendants' deceptive antics pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection 10 Practices Act ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. Lake Breeze did not respond 11 or otherwise defend against Plaintiff's Complaint. Accordingly, the Clerk of Court 12 entered an Order of Default against Lake Breeze. ECF No. 17. Plaintiff now seeks 13 default judgment against Lake Breeze, and requests the Court award damages, 14 including costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

## **STANDARD**

15

16

28

The entry of default judgment is "an extreme measure." *Cmty. Dental Servs.* 17 v. *Tani*, 282 F.3d 1164, 1170 (9th Cir. 2002). "As a general rule, default judgments 18 are disfavored; cases should be decided upon their merits whenever reasonably 19 possible." Westchester Fire Ins. Co. v. Mendez, 585 F.3d 1183, 1189 (9th Cir. 20||2009). To determine whether default judgment is appropriate, a court should 21 consider the following factors: "(1) the possibility of prejudice to the plaintiff; (2) 22 the merits of the plaintiff's substantive claims; (3) the sufficiency of the complaint; 23 (4) the sum of money at stake in the action; (5) the possibility of a dispute 24 concerning material facts; (6) whether the default was due to excusable neglect; 25 and (7) the strong policy underlying the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure favoring 26 decisions on the merits." *Eitel v. McCool*, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471-72 (9th Cir. 1986). 27|| All well-pleaded allegations in a complaint are deemed admitted on a motion for

default judgment. In re Visioneering Const. v. U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty, 661 F.2d 2| 119, 124 (9th Cir. 1981).

## **ANALYSIS**

The Court declines to enter default judgment against Lake Breeze because 5 Plaintiff's FDCPA claim fails as a matter of law. The FDCPA prohibits a debt 6 collector from using "any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means 7 in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. To state a claim 8 under the FDCPA, a plaintiff must allege: (1) plaintiff is a "consumer" within the 9 meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3); (2) defendant is a "debt collector" within the 10 meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6); and (3) defendant "committed some act or 11 omissions in violation of the FDCPA," 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692a-1692o. Beck v. U.S. 12 *Bank Nat'l Ass'n*, No. C17-0882JLR, 2017 WL 6389330, at \*9 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 13 | 14, 2017).

For purposes of a claim based on 15 U.S.C. § 1692e, the FDCPA defines a 15 "debt collector" as "any person who . . . [engages] in any business the principal 16 purpose of which is the collection of any debts, or who regularly collects or 17 attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed 18 or due another." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6) (emphasis added). "[B]y its plain terms this 19 language seems to focus our attention on third party collection agents working for 20 a debt owner—not on a debt owner seeking to collect debts for itself." *Henson v*. 21|| Santander Consumer USA Inc., \_\_ U.S. \_\_, 137 S. Ct. 1718, 1721-22 (2017).

In this case, Lake Breeze does not fall within the definition of a "debt 23 collector." Plaintiff's Complaint alleges Lake Breeze and its employee used a 24 fictitious agency in an attempt to collect a debt for itself. ECF No. 1 at ¶ 5.11. The

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT ^ 3

25

22

14

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Plaintiff's Complaint alleges that all acts and omissions by Defendant Cyd Rossi related to the facts alleged in the lawsuit were performed in the course and scope of 28 his employment with Lake Breeze Incorporated.

Complaint makes clear the "Landlord Protection Agency, Inc." is not involved in 2 the collection of debts allegedly owed to Lake Breeze. What we are left with is 3 Lake Breeze, a debt owner, attempting to collect a debt owed to it. Thus, Plaintiff's 4 Complaint fails to state a FDCPA claim because, as a matter of law, Lake Breeze is 5 not a "debt collector" within the meaning of the statute. **CONCLUSION** For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion is denied. 8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 9 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment, ECF No. 18, is **DENIED**. IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Clerk is hereby directed to enter 10 11 this Order and to provide copies to counsel. 12 **DATED** this 26th day of February 2018. 13 14 15 16 17 Stanley A. Bastian 18 United States District Judge 19 20 21 22 23 24

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT ^ 4

25

26

27

28